

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 17-20 remain in the application. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 10-13 and 15, 17, and 18 have been amended, claims 3, 6, 7, 9, and 19 remain in original form, claims 5, 14, and 20 were previously presented, and claim 16 was canceled without prejudice.

Applicants note that Box 3 of the advisory action was not checked. Thus, applicants believe that the amendments presented in the response to the final rejection have been entered. If the amendments presented in the response to the final rejection have not been entered, applicants respectfully request that they be entered.

Before addressing the remarks in the advisory action, it is respectfully pointed out that applicants teach having uncategorized or uncharacterized data relative to a spatial pattern. Thus, coordinates are available but they have no meaning. Applicants believe this may aid in appreciating applicants' invention.

It was alleged in the Advisory action that applicants' arguments with regard to independent claims 1, 10, and 15 were not persuasive because, among other reasons, it was unclear why applicants discussed the background of Ferrell et al. The rationale for applicants discussing Ferrell et al. in response to the final rejection was to show why applicants' claims are not anticipated by or made obvious in view of Ferrell et al. The logic behind applicants arguments stems from the definition of the term "defect spatial signature." In "An Integrated Spatial Signature Analysis and Automatic Defect Classification System," Shaun S. Gleason et al. define a "defect spatial signature" as a pattern of defects. Ferrell et al. do not teach or suggest analyzing a pattern of defects, rather they teach in column 5, lines 6-11, that a manufacturing image can be characterized in terms of image modality and overall characteristics, substrate-background characteristics, and anomaly-defect characteristics, wherein the characteristics used to describe the modality, background, and defect are based on the texture, color, and shape of the image. Thus, Ferrell et al. view the defects from a microscopic perspective, whereas applicants analyze the pattern of the defects from a macroscopic perspective, i.e., applicants analyze the pattern of defects rather than characteristics of individual defects. In other words, Ferrell et al. do not look at the

pattern of the defects but rather at traits or characteristics of individual defects. Because Ferrell et al. operate on individual or discrete defects rather than a defect spatial signature, Ferrell et al. cannot anticipate or make obvious applicants' claims.

It was further alleged in the Office action that applicants' main argument seems to be that Ferrell's disclosed "feature vectors" do not read on the claimed limitation of defect spatial signatures. Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of a prior art reference cannot read on a claim limitation. Rather, a claim limitation may or may not read on the elements of an infringing apparatus or method. In the present case, the feature vectors of Ferrell et al. neither anticipate nor make obvious applicants' claims because feature vectors are not the same thing as defect spatial signatures. Ferrell et al. teach in the "Abstract" that each extracted feature vector corresponds to a particular characteristic of the manufacturing-specific digital image, for instance, a digital image modality and overall characteristic, a substrate/background characteristic, and an anomaly/defect characteristic. Because, Ferrell et al. are referring to the characterization of single, discrete images, not the spatial pattern or spatial signature formed by a grouping of defects, Ferrell et al. cannot anticipate or make obvious applicants' independent claims 1, 10, and 15, which set forth determining whether a spatial signature corresponds to one that has already occurred.

The Advisory action further alleges that Ferrell et al. disclose storing the feature vectors in a feature vector list as part of the image database and that in a preferred embodiment all images are stored in an image database merely organized in one file directory. The examiner interprets this to mean the images are stored without category. Applicants disagree with the examiner's interpretation. It is respectfully pointed out that, Ferrell et al. teach in column 6, lines 10-13, that an image 8 needn't be stored in any particular database. Rather, in the preferred embodiment, all images 8 stored in the image database merely are organized in one file directory on a computer. Because the images of Ferrell et al. are organized, they are categorized. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that by interpreting the images to be stored without category the Office action misconstrues the teachings of Ferrell et al. and therefore misapplies the reference of Ferrell et al.

CONCLUSION

No new matter is introduced by the amendments herein. Based on the foregoing, applicants believe that all claims under consideration are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6 October 2005 Rennie William Dover

Rennie William Dover, Reg. No. 36,503
THE CAVANAGH LAW FIRM
1850 N. Central Avenue, Ste. 2400
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Telephone: (602) 322-4000